

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs."

Sec. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations) is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item: "Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration."

Sec. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters therebefore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

FLYING OF THE AMERICAN FLAG OVER THE REMAINS OF THE U.S.S. "UTAH"—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKAL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] appear as cosponsors of the measure (S. 703) to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S.S. *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941, at any future printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON REVISION OF THE ANTI-TRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 1255, for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Anti-trust Laws of the United States which I introduced on April 2, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of April 4, 1963:

S. 1270. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items: Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. McGEE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of April 9, 1963:

S. 1283. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes: Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. PROXMIRE.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, for the benefit of those Senators who might be interested, I would like to announce that the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will conduct hearings on S. 283, the Small Reclamation Projects Act on April 23 and on the S. 793 and S. 784, bills to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake and Klamath Wildlife Refuges on April 24.

On May 7, it is my intention to hold hearings on S. 26, the Dixie project located in the State of Utah.

All of these hearings will be held in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, commencing at 10 a.m.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Addresses delivered by Miss Loretta Seppanen and Maurice A. Johnson, at St. Paul, Minn., at the State 4-H Radio Speaking Contest, on March 4 and 5, 1963.

By Mr. BEALL:

Statement and letter of Brenda C. Satterfield, of Baltimore, Md., relating to her candidacy for the Baltimore City Council.

Editorial entitled "Belittling Approach," published in the Baltimore (Md.) Sun on April 10, 1963.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

Editorial entitled "Liberty Amendment's Wishful Thinking," regarding the effect of the abolition of the income tax, and published in the Arizona Daily Star of Tuesday, April 2, 1963.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Editorial entitled "America's Future," published in the Washington (D.C.) Post on April 8, 1963.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Article entitled "Whole Town Pays Respects at Negro Youth's Funeral," published in the Baltimore Sun of March 28, 1963, being a tribute to Ronald Victor Costly, of Elizabeth, W. Va., distinguished Negro athlete and student.

Resolution by Daughters of the American Revolution, District of Columbia Society, urging the establishment of September 17 of each year as a legal holiday, to be known as Constitution Day.

By Mr. BURDICK:

Article entitled "Tax Credit To Offset Gold North Dakota," written by Paul F. Munger and James D. Mathisen.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Minnesota Legislature resolution on agricultural commodities.

Article entitled "Tax Credit to Offset Gold Drain," written by Eliot Janeway, and published in the Chicago Tribune of March 11, 1963.

Article entitled "It Takes More Than That To Kill a Bull Moose," by Hjalmar Peterson, published in the Askov American on October 11, 1962.

SOVIET OIL MENACE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the weapons of Communist conquest are many and diverse. The Kremlin pushes its expansion vigorously and with every means at its command.

As the Soviet Union has continued to broaden its industrial capabilities, international trade has become one of the most subtle, yet effective and dangerous instruments of Red aggression. As members of this Senate are aware, one of the most serious examples of the Kremlin's use of international trade in furthering Red influence is the invasion of free world petroleum markets by Russia.

This is indeed a serious feature of the continuing struggle against communism, because the Kremlin understands full well that oil is a vital and indispensable requirement of every nation. Having developed a large oil producing capacity, the Soviet Union is literally and figuratively flooding selective and sensitive free world markets. Not only does this endanger a healthy economy in these nations, but it gives Communist trade representatives an entree into these areas which otherwise would not be accessible, were it not for the below-the-market prices at which Soviet oil is being offered.

If we are to meet and overcome this Red oil offensive, we must have a full understanding of its meaning in terms of Soviet capability, intentions, and limitations with respect to oil production and distribution.

What is probably the most comprehensive, authoritative, and understandable analysis of the Russian oil situation, both in the Soviet Union, and as an instrument of international trade, appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of Sunday, March 31, 1963. The article was an extensive reprint of excerpts from a recent speech delivered in Fort Worth, Tex., by Mr. George F. Getty of Los Angeles, Calif., president of the Tidewater Oil Co.

This is a particularly valuable contribution to our understanding of Communist oil export for two reasons. First, Mr. Getty is recognized as one of the most progressive and capable figures in the oil industry today. Secondly, he bases his report upon personal observations made by him in the course of an extended tour of important oil producing areas in the Soviet Union. Thus his first-hand observations, coupled with his vast experience in the oil industry, serve to make this speech both authoritative and informative.

I believe that after reading this speech, reprinted from the Washington Star, Members of this Senate will share my opinion that this is a most valuable contribution to our understanding of Russian techniques of expansion through the use of trade. It underlines the seriousness of the problem confronting us, and the necessity of keeping our Nation's petroleum industry technologically advanced and economically sound.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech of Mr. Getty printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. EXPERT SEES RISING SOVIET OIL OFFENSIVE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—George F. Getty II, president of the Tidewater Oil Co., recently returned from an inspection tour of the Soviet oil industry. Here are excerpts from a report he made to the American Petroleum Institute meeting in Fort Worth, Tex., earlier this month.)

April 11

We meet today as the oil industry is threatened on many fronts. Such a confrontation is not unusual for us, but today's threats are possibly the most ominous to date in our industry's history.

Most of you are concerned mainly with exploration and production work. Your work is challenging and difficult. It would be doubly challenging—in fact, confounding—if you had to work amidst violent revolutions, border wars or Communist subversion. Yet this was the case recently for our oilmen in Iraq and Yemen; while those working in Venezuela are in the middle of communism's No. 1 target in Latin America.

Added to the oil operators' troubles these days is the cut-throat competition of the largest oil organization in the world—the government-controlled Soviet oil industry. We think our domestic oil business is competitive. Well, many of you may be familiar with an example of really tough competition. In a recent "price war," the Russians forced free world companies to lower prices by offering India Soviet oil at 10 to 20 percent below prevailing world prices—which were already somewhat depressed.

THE BATTLE AND THE WAR

They were shrewd. They dealt the free world a blow merely by cutting prices on a bid; they didn't have to use up even one barrel of oil to win a trade war victory. To keep the business, Western companies were forced to make the sale at Soviet prices. Isn't that called winning the battle but losing the war?

The Soviet oil industry is unique. From the selamograph to export marketing it is operated—perhaps inefficiently, and often dangerously—with only one goal in mind: defeating the aims and ideals of everyone in this room.

As you may know, I was a member of the U.S. petroleum delegation that spent a month getting a first-hand, on-the-spot view of certain Soviet oil operations. Although there is a great temptation when one comes back from a foreign country to be an expert, even a Russian would have difficulty being an expert in the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Union is a difficult, complex country.

WHAT U.S. OILMEN SAW

Nevertheless, our tour of Russia gave us a reasonable opportunity to observe the Soviet oil industry at work. Let me sketch for you what our visiting oilmen saw in the Soviet Union.

We like to pride ourselves on our accomplishments in oil development. But the agency running the Soviet exploration and production is a hard-working crew that cut our time in half. In 15 years, from 1946 to 1962, they increased oil production from only 432,000 barrels a day to 3.3 million barrels. That's quite a jump. Some time ago, we made the same increase in our own production, but it took us 31 years, from 1907 to 1939.

Even though the Soviets had all the technical advances since 1907 working in their favor, their record is an obvious accomplishment. With 3.3 million barrels, in world production they are second only to our own 7 million barrels daily. For the end of their present 7-year plan, in 1965, they have targeted production at 4.8 million barrels daily.

NO LABOR PROBLEMS FOR THEM

Oil field development is controlled carefully under the 7-year plan. The nation itself owns the land and the minerals, of course. There are no leases, no royalties. There are no labor problems—despite the fact that 25 percent of the oil industry workers are women. The government just goes ahead and does as it pleases. Labor, for example, is freely transferred from one region to another to balance quality and quantity.

The Soviet production objective is maximum recovery of reserves in the shortest period of time. They have a use for all the oil and gas that they can get their hands on. They want to get the oil out and use it, not to produce it over a long period of time; the latter would be better oil field engineering practice, but poor overall economic and political practice for the Soviets. About 10 percent of Soviet wells are wildcats.

Our trip had many surprises. For example, counter to our thinking that Baku was the great source of Soviet oil, this region produces only 22 percent of the Soviet's total. After World War II, the Soviets began exploring other regions. They were handed an energy gift on a silver platter when they discovered the Volga-Urals fields, strategically located between Moscow and their tremendous, newly industrialized area east of the Urals. The Soviet's couldn't have gotten a more economic supply of oil if they had designed the situation in one of their own 7-year plans.

Under the present 7-year plan, they are constructing huge petroleum pipelines. These amounted to 19,700 miles of oil line and 18,300 miles of gas line in 1961; about twice their trunk pipeline mileage in 1958. This doesn't sound like much compared with what we're doing here in the United States. On the other hand, when you consider that the average diameter of these pipes is 40 inches, their carrying capacity is tremendous. These pipelines carry oil to the satellite countries, the Black Sea, and may eventually carry it to the Sea of Japan—all places where their export potential is greatest.

The Soviet Union also is expanding its merchant fleet. Soviet officials stated that luckily they don't have to build tankers because the free world has been so nice and built so many extra ones which are available at low charter rates. But we gathered from several conversations and recent reports that large tankers, 25,000 to 35,000 tons, are being constructed on the Black Sea. We also know they have contracted for large ships in Japan and Italy.

This tanker and pipeline expansion certainly adds to the free world's increasing problems with Soviet oil exports, as you have seen pointed up by the newspaper accounts of a possible Soviet deal with England for ships.

Refinery capacity has been a bottleneck in their plans. Refinery runs in 1958 totaled a shade over 2.6 million barrels a day. These increased to 4.25 million barrels daily in 1962 and are scheduled to reach 5 million in 1965. With this capacity, it is possible that after satisfying home requirements, they will have about 440,000 barrels of refined products daily for free world export.

THE MODELS ARE IMPRESSIVE, BUT—

We visited the Novo Ufa refinery. It employs about 5,000 people, 600 of these are engineers and technicians. It's basically a large topping plant with limited cracking and reforming facilities. But don't forget, the Soviets primarily require fuel oil and middle distillates, not high octane gasoline. They see no point in putting in a lot of octane and gasoline building equipment.

Characteristically, Soviet industry in most areas lags substantially behind the United States. At the permanent exhibition of Soviet achievement in Moscow, where they have a Hall of Geology, a Hall of Oil and Gas, and a Hall of Petroleum Science, we saw models of wonderful drilling rigs, bits, refineries, and petro-chemical plants. But the actual equipment we saw in the field was nothing to get excited about.

We trekked through four oilfields, toured four of their largest refineries, visited the four best research institutes, but we saw little evidence of this wonderful equipment. It just wasn't in operation where we were.

NOT VERY IMPRESSED

After we had seen Soviet oil operations we put our heads together to compare notes. We were not particularly impressed. But realistically, we had to recognize their tremendous potential. You cannot deny their great oil and gas fields, their vast reserves. You can't deny their successful, almost explosive development of oil and gas resources and oil export opportunities.

At this point it might be well to see what kind of conclusions can be drawn from this sketch of what we saw of the Soviet oil industry.

I am convinced that the Soviets have used and will continue to use their abundant oil resources to expedite their own industrial expansion and to extend their political influence, undermine freedom, and spread communism in the free world.

The Soviets' crude oil production allowed them in 1953 to export 35,000 barrels a day to the free world. In 1961, this jumped to a 610,000-barrel-a-day average, or 3 percent of the free world oil demand. They flatly told us they intend to up that 3 percent to 14 percent, and you know they aren't going to spend the rest of their lives doing it. Their present 7-year plan calls for exports of 1 million barrels a day to the free world in 1965. To do this, they're going to use their system of moving into oil markets, upsetting them, withdrawing from them and moving into others.

We face a massive, aggressive competitor who can cut prices at will and barter, accept soft currencies, and do business in ways that would stymie or ruin a Western oil company. In 1961, this competition cost traditional exporting countries, particularly Venezuela and certain Middle Eastern States, \$486 million in lost revenue. And the competition will get tougher.

WHAT THE SOVIET NEEDS

The Soviet oil industry is in dire need of exploration, production, and transportation equipment. To an important extent, the success of the Soviet oil threat depends on how successful they are in obtaining line pipe, drilling rigs, pumps, oil country tubular goods, and so on. They also need tankers and complete refinery units, petrochemical plants, and electronic gear in order to fulfill their 7-year goal.

Let's not kid ourselves. They are going to trade their oil for this equipment and these facilities, as well as for raw materials, food, chemicals, and other commodities from manufacturers and producers in the free world. One can't get around the fact that this trade with the Communists has been, and will be, freely entered into by many nations because, as in all enduring commercial relationships, both parties expect to benefit. Over a billion dollars' worth of plant, equipment, and metal goods were sold to the Communist bloc by the free world in 1960.

Take Italy, for example, the Soviets bartered 100,000 barrels of crude oil a day over a 5-year period—about 20 percent of the Italian oil requirements—in return for specific quantities of much needed 40-inch pipe, pumps, synthetic fibers and other essentials. Italy picks up the oil at Black Sea ports at a price equivalent to \$1 a barrel. At that price, it's hardly worth taking oil out of the ground in Texas.

It could be said that all of your work in finding reserves, to meet future production requirements will be a waste of time if the Soviets are allowed to carry out this threat and to undermine the security of the free world. However, while I am completely convinced of the Soviet threat, I am equally convinced that the free world's oil companies can be counted on to resist to their utmost in any struggle for the world's oil markets.

SOVIET EXPORTS HAVE LEVELLED OFF

Already there is evidence supporting this prediction. After increasing at an annual rate of about 40 percent for the past 3 years, oil exports have leveled off. Remember, oil export potential does not necessarily mean sales, even for as aggressive a competitor as the Soviets.

But let's not drop our guard. The leveling might just be due to a lack of present capacity in Soviet pipelines and tankers.

My conviction that Western oil companies can resist Soviet competition is not based on blind faith. It is based on the expectation that certain things must happen.

To meet Soviet competition, American oil companies must at least remain as strong and healthy as they are today. They must effectively supply a steadily growing demand in the United States and in the free world. They must continue to operate a vast distribution and marketing network which guarantees delivery of petroleum products where and when they are needed.

The Soviets don't yet have such a network and can't guarantee delivery. Most important, American oil companies must continue to develop present reserves and build future length by discovering new reserves.

THE FIRST DECADE: CHANGE AND CHALLENGE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is 10 years old this month. In its first decade the Department has faced new problems that are foreseen only by a very few far-sighted persons during the 30-year struggle to establish such a Department. Our school population, for example, has increased from 37 million in 1952 to 52 million in 1962, and the number of persons 65 years or over has increased from 10 million to 17 million in the same decade. Great numbers of our citizens are moving from farm to city; our economy has grown from \$365 billion in 1953 to \$544 billion in 1962.

These changes have brought social and economic problems of vital concern to the HEW, and the Department has become more and more concerned about the impact of such change upon the citizens of our Nation. The present Secretary, Anthony Celebrezze, has said that it will be the responsibility of the Department in the next decade, as it was during the first 10 years, to help make available to all citizens full opportunities for the development of their talents and abilities. The Secretary's words were printed in the introduction to the April 1963 edition of the HEW Indicators. The same introduction also summarizes the history and importance of the Department. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the introduction was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST DECADE: CHANGE AND CHALLENGE

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the newest Federal agency to be represented in the President's Cabinet. However, the responsibilities it bears for the well-being of the American people date back to the early years of our Republic.

They began in 1785, when the Congress of the Confederation made grants of public lands to the States for public schools.

They were added to in 1798, when the Fifth Congress established the Marine Hospital Service—precursor of today's Public Health Service.

In 1867 the Federal Office of Education was established; in 1907 the Food and Drug Administration began as the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture; in 1912 the Children's Bureau was established; in 1920 the predecessor of the present Vocational Rehabilitation Administration began its important work; and in 1935 the Social Security Board was organized.

All these agencies were brought together in 1939 under the framework of the Federal Security Agency, and 14 years later the Agency was given Cabinet status when it became the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In this chronology of the Department's growth, we can trace the Nation's growing recognition of the need for Federal participation in promoting the general welfare of the American people. Through periods of prosperity and depression, through civil strife and world conflict, the Federal Government has shared in the national concern for the well-being of every citizen.

We are now in an era of change and challenge which in many ways eclipses those critical periods of our past.

We are in the midst of a technological revolution which is changing the pattern of life and work of the American people.

As our national strength and prosperity have increased, we have grown more and more aware of pressing problems within our society which cry out for solution—problems of great magnitude and complexity that are beyond the resources of the individual and his local and State governments.

Some of these problems have long been with us and require solution even more urgently today; some are the outgrowth of the technological forces which are altering our society; others have arisen as a natural consequence of the higher human expectations of larger numbers of citizens.

In education, for example, we have a shortage of facilities and well-trained teachers at the same time that we face increasing demands for more schooling for more people. We have millions of young people and millions of adults whose lack of adequate education prevents them from enjoying a full measure of the Nation's prosperity and from making their full contribution to society.

Our aged men and women, those in the lowest income group and most subject to illness, have tragically inadequate insurance against the high cost of hospital care and related health services.

Other problems in our society represent an appalling waste of human lives and human potential: mental illness and mental retardation, drug addiction, accidents, juvenile delinquency.

Increasingly we are concerned with problems of air and water pollution, and the proliferation of chemicals in the production and processing of foods.

In the following pages are summarized the progress this Department has made during the past decade in carrying out its responsibilities for the well-being of the American people.

As we review the successes of the Department's first 10 years, let us look forward to a second decade of helping to make available to all citizens full opportunities for the development of their talents and abilities. These are our most precious resources—our hope for the future.

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education,
and Welfare.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—PAYMENT IN GOLD FOR U.S. ASSETS ABROAD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 14, I spoke in the Senate about reports in the press and on the radio that France might organize with other countries of Western Europe to demand payment in gold for the U.S. assets they hold.

I have already placed in the RECORD the reply I received from Treasury Secretary Dillon to my inquiry about the truth of these allegations. That material, as it relates to France, appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 28.

Today I wish to insert material on this subject sent to me by the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Facts regarding the position of the Federal Republic of Germany with respect to the United States balance of payment

[Millions of dollars]

	German trade with the United States		
	1960	1961	1962
Imports.....	1,422.5	1,515.8	1,758.3
Exports.....	886.6	870.1	965.7
U.S. surplus.....	535.9	645.7	792.6

NOTE.—The above mentioned figures include German purchases of United States military equipments.

(2) The German Government agreed in buying U.S. military equipment for approximately \$700 millions annually. This amount matches the annual military expenditures of the United States in Germany. The Federal Republic of Germany makes anticipated payments for the supply of military equipments generating additional receipts in the framework of the U.S. balance of payments.

(3) In 1961 the Federal Republic of Germany made a debt prepayment in the amount of \$587 million, larger than any other prepayment made by any other country.

(4) The "Deutsche Bundesbank" (the independent central bank in Germany) has concluded "swap" agreements in the amount of \$150 million with the U.S. monetary authorities in 1962.

(5) The Bundesbank has credited to the Treasury deutsche marks in the amount of \$200 million against medium-term bonds in January and February 1963.

(6) During 1962 the Bundesbank has bought practically no gold from the U.S. monetary authorities although the German short-term claims climbed near to the \$3 billion mark.

(7) Mr. Blessing, the president of the Bundesbank, and other top ranking German bankers have declared repeatedly and publicly their confidence in the soundness of the U.S. currency thus contributing considerably to the stability of the dollar in the German and the international finance market.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I am somewhat reassured by the cooperation Germany has extended us so far on this financial problem, I do not view with any assurance at all the continuation of such large obligations in the hands of

April 11

both Germany and France. As this data indicates, West Germany has short-term U.S. claims close to \$3 billion in value. France has claims on us of at least \$1 billion.

The United States must make every effort to reduce these obligations in Western Europe just as fast as possible. A 1962 report of the Joint Economic Committee on this subject made this observation:

The tendency for countries like Germany, France, and Italy to continue accumulating gold and dollars rather than to spend more of their rising export income on imports, on capital investment in other countries, and on foreign aid, has been responsible for a large part of the free world's payments imbalance.

The report I have quoted from is entitled, "U.S. Payments Policies Consistent with Domestic Objectives of Maximum Employment and Growth," and is a report of the subcommittee on international exchange and payments.

I shall have more to say on this subject at a future date, but in the meantime, I welcome the statement from West Germany and I hope we can continue to count on her help in easing what has become for us a serious financial problem.

EASTER, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, with the advent of the joyous season of Easter, it is fitting that we pause in reverent contemplation of the meaning to the Christian world of the momentous event which renders this commemoration so sacred, so historic, so imperishable. Easter is at once a feast of solemnity and joy, a call to the silence of adoration and to the ecstasy of rapture, as the full significance of the Resurrection touches our hearts. As His death was the ultimate expression of Christ's love for man, so was His Resurrection an affirmation of the eternal victory of the spirit over the flesh. This sublime event symbolizes as well the high destiny reserved to God-created man, and reminds us anew of the common brotherhood we share in this mortal world, and of the deep and hallowed obligations such a brotherhood imposes. May the sacred and joyous feast of Easter find voice in our lives as well as in our thoughts, and make us more worthy of the love that has made this moment immortal in the history of Christian man.

PAN AMERICAN DAY, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, April 14 marks an anniversary of unusual significance to Americans. It is the 73d anniversary of the Inter-American system, and it is called Pan American Day. This system of free and sovereign nations, now formally embodied in the Organization of American States, is the oldest international organization of its type in the modern world. We Americans of the north are proud of this Organization. We are proud of its concepts of equality, peaceful settlement of disputes, and cooperation for mutual social, economic, and cultural betterment for the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

It was the "George Washington" of South America, Simón Bolívar, who first envisaged and tried to organize the young nations of the Western Hemisphere, newly independent of European colonialism. These earliest efforts failed to crystallize, and it was not until 1890, at the initiative of the Secretary of State, James Blaine, that the First International Conference of American States was held here in Washington, and the pan-American idea took concrete form.

Since that time, this oldest of international organizations has come a long way. One of the fundamental precepts of the pan-American idea was that here, in the New World, we Americans could start afresh on a system of international relations which would differ from the older European habits of wars and entanglements. In these limited aims we have been largely successful. But it is the more recent, positive aims that we Americans have set for ourselves that challenge our concept of peaceful cooperation for progress.

The Alliance for Progress embodies these positive aims of the Organization of American States. We must not weary of the burdens or the complexities of the noble tasks which we have set for ourselves, but on this 73d Pan American Day must dedicate ourselves anew to the accomplishment of hemispheric solidarity, peaceful progress, and justice and equality for all Americans.

THE YOUTH CORPS BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record letters I have received in support of the Youth Corps bill, passed yesterday, from three prominent citizens of my State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CIRCUIT COURT OF
THE STATE OF OREGON,
Salem, Oreg., April 5, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I urge favorable action by this session of Congress on Senate bill 1 and House bill 1890. The immediate development of youth work camps and employment programs are a must in an effective attack on the serious and the increasing problem of delinquency that faces America today.

This proposed legislation is necessary to help youth with problems—problems that are daily becoming more imminent because of the lack of employment for youth and because so many youngsters, who are school dropouts, find themselves walking the streets in idleness and no foreseeable purpose in life.

We must act now to help those unfortunate products of our rapidly changing society accelerated by automation and other aspects of this technological age.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH B. FELTON,
Circuit Judge.

PARISH OF ST. MARK
THE EVANGELIST,
Hood River, Oreg., April 3, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ;

I would add my voice to the several with whom I've had the opportunity to discuss the matter on urging your support of the Youth Employment Act of 1963 (S. 1 and H.R. 1890).

Even in such communities as Hood River, which certainly has a present low youth problem, the situation facing the young men and women who can neither go on to school or find adequate employment; or who are for that matter, potential delinquency candidates, we recognize a definite need for adequate program. We have pioneered the summer work camp, and the benefits of this bill would certainly extend the effectiveness of such programs.

Perhaps the opponents to this measure (and I understand it is being opposed mainly on cost) should see that a few millions of dollars spent in saving youth is better spent than \$1 building weapons which could destroy them.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

ALBERT E. ALLEN.

OFFICE OF COUNTY COURT
OF FOLK COUNTY,
Dallas, Oregon, April 3, 1963.

Sen. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: I am writing to you in regard to Senate bill 1 that I believe is in committee at this time, and would like to express my interest in this type legislation. Although I do not approve of all provisions of the bill, I think it is a splendid start in the right direction. I believe the original CCC we worked under during the depression would come as near accomplishing the desired results with our many unemployed young men. I also believe the time is at hand when we must realize the seriousness of the unemployed youth in our country and, under our present system of automation, it is impossible for all of them to find jobs. The last report I read in the Juvenile Journal, we have seven hundred thousand youths drop out of high school every year who are ill prepared to meet the challenge of today's living standards. Serving in the capacity of Juvenile Judge, many young people come before me through out the year requesting a chance for employment and of course, we have nothing to offer them. I am sure if we had something of the YCC program it would give these young people a chance to keep busy and have a tendency to lead them away from a life of delinquency, giving them a good foundation for citizens of our country.

If there is anything I can do on the home front to help promote this type legislation, feel free to call upon me. At your convenience, please keep me informed as to the status of the bill at this time.

Sincerely yours,

C. M. BAERNHART.

P.S.—I intended to include this in my letter too: Many of us in the county are greatly disappointed with the accelerated work program that was inaugurated by Congress. I am sure the people who sponsored this bill had no intention that the Government agencies, such as the Agriculture and Interior Departments, would take advantage of the moneys that were appropriated. They already come under the national budget for large sums and I feel this money should have been, and was intended to be, for local programs and be distributed to take care of the unemployed situation throughout the country. As I understand the bill, it calls for \$900 million, but only \$400 million was appropriated. I hope Congress sees fit to appropriate the other \$500 million and tie it up so that it will be assured it will go to small local projects in communities throughout the United States.